APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,332	04/06/2001	Michael Kelbaugh	723-1081	6939

27562   7590   11/26/2008
NIXON & VANDERHYE, P.C.
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER
RAMPURIA, SATISH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 August 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-21,23-31,33-50,52-61,63-71 and 73-85* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-21,23-31,33-50,52-61,63-71 and 73-85* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   In view of the Pre-Appeal brief filed on 08/28/2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY

REOPENED. New grounds of rejection set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following

two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37

CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an

appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee

can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have

been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between

the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing

below:

2.   Claims cancelled by the Applicant: 11, 22, 32, 51, 62 and 72.

3.   Claims 1-10, 12-21, 23-31, 33-50, 52-61, 63-71 and 73-85 are pending.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view

of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6.   Claims 1-10, 12-21, 23-31, 33-45, 52-60, 81-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because

the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1, 21, 41 and 81 are merely a thought or an abstract idea. They are not tied to a

statutory class. They appear can be performed as mental steps. Claims 2-10, 12-20 directly or

indirectly depends on claim 1; claims 23-31,33-40 directly or indirectly depends on claim 21; 42-

50,52-60, directly or indirectly depends on claim 41; 82-85 directly or indirectly depends on

claim 81. Thus, dependent claims fail to cure the deficiency of the independent claims and are

suffering the similar deficiency as their independent claims 1, 21, 41 and 81.

Claim objections

7.   Claim 77 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 77, on line 4 of the claim, after the word "system" has twice period (.).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9.   Claim 2-10, 12-20, 23-31, 33-40,42-50, 52-60, 63-71, 73-80 and 82-85 rejected under 35

U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and

distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2-10, 12-20, 23-31, 33-40,42-50, 52-60, 63-71, 73-80 and 82-85, recites the

limitation "A" in the preamble. It appears to be an independent claim. Instead, it should have

been "The" in the preamble. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the

claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 1-8, 14-16, 18-21, 23-29, 35-37, 39-42, 43-46, 48, 54-56, 58-60, and 81-85 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,282,701 to

Wygodny et al. (hereinafter called Wygodny) in view of US Patent No. 6,701,514 to Haswell et

al. (hereinafter called Haswell).

Per claims 1, 6, 27:

Wygodny discloses:

1. (previously presented) A method for processing and monitoring software bug related

information for use in software package development comprising the steps of:

providing a bug tracking system (col. 4, lines 48-49 "BugTrapper tools are used to monitor and

analyze the execution of a computer program") which is accessible using an Internet browser

(col. 3, lines 14-15 ""graphical user interface");

one bug tracking (col. 4, lines 48 "BugTrapper tools") related menu (col. 8, lines 57-60 "The

analyzer frame 300 further provides a menu bar 304, a dockable toolbar 306, and a status bar

312. The menu bar 304 provides drop-down menus labeled "File," "Edit," "View," "Executable,"

and "Help."")

Wygodny does not explicitly discloses processing user identification information including a

password; and providing, in response to said user identification information, the contents of

which vary based on the user's role in the software development process.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system processing user

identification information including a password (col. 25, lines 66-67 "user may be authenticated

by verifying a user name and a password"); and providing, in response to said user identification

information (col. 25, lines 56 "the users is authenticated"), the contents of which vary based on

the user's role in the software development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of

the identity of the user.... the user is allowed to view and change the information... that is

associated with the user... single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored... based on the

information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which

defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of processing user identification information including a password; and providing, in response to said user identification information, the contents of which vary based on the user's role in the software development process as taught by Haswell into the method of debugging a computer program as taught by Wygodny. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have log-in information and then display the content based on user's role so that user can only access those components/program/modules which they have been authorized to.

Per claim 21:

Wygodny discloses:

21. (previously presented)

A method of processing and monitoring software bug related information for use in software package development comprisingthe steps of:

providing a bug tracking system (col. 4, lines 48-49 "BugTrapper tools are used to monitor and analyze the execution of a computer program") which is accessible using an Internet browser (col. 3, lines 14-15 ""graphical user interface");

a bug tracking (col. 4, lines 48 "BugTrapper tools") related menu (col. 8, lines 57-60 "The analyzer frame 300 further provides a menu bar 304, a dockable toolbar 306, and a status bar

312. The menu bar 304 provides drop-down menus labeled "File," "Edit," "View," "Executable,"

and "Help.""),

editing bug related information using said bug tracking related menu (col. 6, lines 18-20 "the

developer can edit the TCI file 120 or create a new TCI file 120 while viewing results from a

trace log file 122"); and

transmitting at least the edited bug related information via the Internet to a second user (col. 6,

lines 51-52 "the TCI file 120, and the trace log file 122 are preferably small enough to be sent

via email between the developer 112 and the user 110").

Wygodny does not explicitly discloses processing a first user identification information

including a password; providing, in response to said user identification information, the contents

of which vary based on a first role, of said first user, in the software evelopment process; a

second role different from the first role in developing said software package.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system processing a first user

identification information including a password (col. 25, lines 66-67 "user may be authenticated

by verifying a user name and a password") ; and providing, in response to said user identification

information (col. 25, lines 56 "the users is authenticated"), the contents of which vary based on a

first role, of said first user, in the software development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon

authentication of the identity of the user…. the user is allowed to view and change the

information… that is associated with the user… single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored…

based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col.

49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the

interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.) a second role

different from the first role in developing said software package (see the table on col. 49-50

which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities).

Per claim 41, 42:

Wygodny discloses:

41. (previously presented)

A method of processing and monitoring

software bug related information for use in software package development comprising

the steps of:

providing a bug tracking system (col. 4, lines 48-49 "BugTrapper tools are used to monitor and

analyze the execution of a computer program") accessible via the Internet (col. 3, lines 14-15

"graphical user interface");

retrieving from a database associated with said bug tracking system (col. 5, lines 44-53 "An

agent-side trace library… The client-side trace library… the agent-side trace library 124 are

referred to collectively as the "trace library."…obtain the trace information") a list of bugs

associated with an identified software package (col. 2, lines 54-55 "identifying and isolating

bugs within a client program"); and

sorting said list of bugs (col. 7, lines 39-40 "analyzer 106 is used to analyze the trace data and

isolate the bug") in accordance with any of one a plurality of user selected

sort criteria (col. 8, lines 40-43 "developer 112 to open multiple trace tree windows and define a

different filter (i.e., sorting) for each of window… multiple windows with different filters are

handled by the User Interface").

Wygodny does not explicitly disclose processing user identification information including a

password, wherein the processing includes determining the aspects of a system that a user is

entitled to access based on a user's role in the development process.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system processing user

identification information including a password (col. 25, lines 66-67 "user may be authenticated

by verifying a user name and a password"); and wherein the processing includes determining the

aspects of a system that a user is entitled to access (col. 25, lines 56 "the users is authenticated"),

based on a user's role in the development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of

the identity of the user…. the user is allowed to view and change the information… that is

associated with the user… single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored… based on the

information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which

defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be

tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.)

Per claim 81:

Wygodny discloses:

81. (previously presented) A method for processing and monitoring

software bug related information for use in software package development comprising

the steps of:

enabling access to a bug tracking system (col. 4, lines 48-49 "BugTrapper tools are used to

monitor and analyze the execution of a computer program") using an Internet browser (col. 3,

lines 14-15 "graphical user interface");

one bug tracking (col. 4, lines 48 "BugTrapper tools") related menu (col. 8, lines 57-60 "The

analyzer frame 300 further provides a menu bar 304, a dockable toolbar 306, and a status bar

312. The menu bar 304 provides drop-down menus labeled "File," "Edit," "View," "Executable,"

and "Help."").

Wygodny does not disclose processing user identification information including a password

from a first user having a first role in the software development process which is different from

at least a second role, of at least a second user, in the software development process; providing,

in response to said user information from the first user, the contents of which vary based on the

first user's role in the software development process; processing user identification information

including a password from the second

user; and providing, in response to said user identification information from the second user, at

least, different from the first bug tracking menu, the contents of which vary based on the second

user's role in the software development process.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system processing user

identification information including a password (col. 25, lines 66-67 "user may be authenticated

by verifying a user name and a password") from a first user having a first role in the software

development process which is different from at least a second role, of at least a second user, in

the software development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the

user.... the user is allowed to view and change the information... that is associated with the user... single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored... based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.); providing, in response to said user information from the first user (col. 25, lines 56 "the users is authenticated"), the contents of which vary based on the first user's role in the software development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the user.... the user is allowed to view and change the information... that is associated with the user... single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored... based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.); processing user identification information including a password from the second user (col. 25, lines 66-67 "user may be authenticated by verifying a user name and a password"); and providing, in response to said user identification information from the second user (col. 25, lines 56 "the users is authenticated"), at least, different from the first bug tracking menu, the contents of which vary based on the second user's role in the software development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the user.... the user is allowed to view and change the information... that is associated with the user... single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored... based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored

based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.) Note here the first and second user in Haswell is developer and tester as shown in table on col. 49-50.

Per claims 2-5, 23-26, and 43-46:

The rejection of claims 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, Wygodny discloses the bug tracking related menu as applied to claims 1, 21, and 41 above. Wygodny does not explicitly disclose that the menu (content) are tailored to users e.g., testers, project coordinator, developer.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system that a single interface i.e., content is tailored based on the information associated with the user (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the user.... the user is allowed to view and change the information… that is associated with the user… single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored… based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of the menu (content) are tailored to users e.g., testers, project coordinator, developer as taught by Haswell into the method for debugging the software as taught by Wygodny. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have the menu (content) are tailored to users e.g., testers, project coordinator, developer so that user can only access those components/program/modules which they have been authorized to.

Per claims 7, 8, 28, 29, and 48:

The rejection of claims 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Wygodny

disclose:

accessing a database and retrieving data indicative of a plurality of bugs in a selected software

package (col. 5, lines 44-53 "An agent-side trace library… The client-side trace library… the

agent-side trace library 124 are referred to collectively as the "trace library."… obtain the trace

information" and col. 2, lines 54-55 "identifying and isolating bugs within a client program");

and

sorting the bugs based upon any one of a plurality of sorting criteria selected by a user (col. 7,

lines 39-40 "analyzer 106 is used to analyze the trace data and isolate the bug" and col. 8, lines

40-43 "developer 112 to open multiple trace tree windows and define a different filter (i.e.,

sorting) for each of window… multiple windows with different filters are handled by the User

Interface").

Per claim 14-16, 35-37, and 54-56:

The rejection of claim 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Wygodny disclose:

transmitting a bug related message (col. 3, lines 31-32 "developer sends the TCI file for the

particular client to a remote user") using a provided bug related menu (col. 4, line 48 and col. 8,

lines 57-60).

Wygodny does not explicitly disclose a first user having a first role in developing said software

package to a second user having a second role in developing said software package.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system a first user having a first

role in developing said software package to a second user having a second role in developing

said software package (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the user.... the

user is allowed to view and change the information... that is associated with the user... single

interface (i.e., the content) is tailored... based on the information associated with the user" also

see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their

responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's

role and will be displayed.)

The feature of providing a first user having a first role in developing said software

package to a second user having a second role in developing said software package would be

obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Per claim 18, 39, 58:

The rejection of claim 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Wygodny disclose:

18. A method according to claim 1, further including the steps of:

generating a bug related communication (col. 5, lines 48-49) using a bug tracking related menu

(col. 4, lines 48);

transmitting said bug related communication to a recipient via the Internet (col. 6, lines 51-52).

Wygodny does not explicitly disclose encrypting said bug related communication

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system encrypting said bug related communication (col. 81, lines 36-37).

The feature of providing encrypting said bug related communication would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Per claims 20 and 60:

The rejection of claims 1 and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Wygodny disclose: editing bug related information using said at least one bug tracking related menu (col. 6, lines 18-20 "the developer can edit the TCI file 120 or create a new TCI file 120 while viewing results from a trace log file 122").

Per claims 19, 40, and 59:

The rejection of claims 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Wygodny does not explicitly disclose accessing a test plan identifying a plurality of tests to be performed with respect to an identified software package.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system accessing a test plan identifying a plurality of tests to be performed with respect to an identified software package (col. 50, lines 40-43"Develop and execute a test plan to properly exercise new application including new, modified, and unmodified functionality").

The feature of providing accessing a test plan identifying a plurality of tests to be performed with respect to an identified software package would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 82-85 are the method claim corresponding to method claims 2-5 respectively, and

rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 2-5

respectively, above, as noted above.

12.   Claims 9-10, 12-13, 30, 31, 33, 34, 49-50, 52, 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Wygodny, Haswell in view of US Pub. No. 2001/0049697 to Johndrew

et al. (hereinafter called Johndrew).

Per claims 9-10, 12-13, 30, 31, 33, 34, 49, 50, 52, and 53:

The rejection of claims 8, 28, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, neither Wygodny

nor Haswell explicitly disclose wherein said sorting criteria includes video game stage or a video

game character or the status of the bug or the type of bug or the reported date of the bug.

However, Johndrew discloses in an analogous computer system sorting criteria includes

video game stage or a video game character or the status of the bug or the type of bug or the

reported date of the bug (page 3 and 4, paragraph 46 "FIG. 7 shows the data collected by the

process of FIG. 6. Bug ID screen 700 includes the query component selection index 310, a bug

identifier header 705, a bug headline 710 and a release table 715. Bug identifier header 705

gives the bug identifier associated with the information on the screen… Bug headline 710

contains a short one line description of the bug… Column 725 indicates the status of the bug…

Column 730 contains the date and time that software fixing the bug").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of sorting/identifying bugs based on unique

identifiers as taught by Johndrew into the method for monitoring the software bug as taught in

the combination system by Wygodny and Haswell. The modification would be obvious because

of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to sort the bugs to provide complete bugs

free software application to client as suggested by Johndrew (page 1, paragraph 10).

13.   Claims 17, 38, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Wygodny, Haswell in view of admitted prior art (APA).

Per claims 17, 38, and 57:

The rejection of claims 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, neither Wygodny

nor Haswell explicitly disclose attaching to a bug description a digitized video file for visually

displaying at least one screen display showing an identified bug.

However, APA discloses attaching to a bug description a digitized video file for visually

displaying at least one screen display showing an identified bug (Applicant's specification, page

2, lines 9-11 "tester… associate a tester recorded sequence of game screen displays to provide a

visual depiction of the error sequence")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of displaying a digitized video file for visually

displaying as taught in APA into the method for monitoring the software bug as taught in the

combination system by Wygodny and Haswell. The modification would be obvious because of

one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to display the bug information which is would

be for video game to have better understanding of the bugs found during testing as suggested in

APA (pages 3, lines 4-12).

14.   Claims 61, 63-69, 75-77, 79-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Haswell in view of Wygodny.

Per claim 61, 67:

Haswell discloses:

61. (previously presented)

A software bug related processing and tracking system comprising:

a first computer system for use by a software developer including a processing system for

executing an Internet browser (Fig. 32, element 3200);

an encryption system coupled to said first computer for encrypting data transmitted via the

Internet by said first computer (col. 81, lines 36-37 "encryption to protect your data as it's sent

over an insecure network");

a second computer system for use by a software tester including a processing system for

executing an Internet browser (Fig. 32, element 3300);

a third computer system for use by a software project coordinator including a processing system

for executing an Internet processor (col. 49, lines 37-45 "Technical Manager Typically an IS

department head with responsibility for the purchase and/or support of hardware and software. In

configuration management, this role is more software oriented. Other responsibilities include:

Assign development and support staff to projects. Review (accept/reject) technical approach

proposed for projects. Monitor development and support budgets and personnel - status of

projects") [Here having an computer for technical manager would be inherent since the technical

manager is responsible for assigning and completion of the job.]; and

a web server for storing a bug tracking system and for permitting an authorized software

developer, an authorized software tester, and an authorized project coordinator to access said bug

tracking system and to communicate with each other via said bug tracking system (col. 25, 51-53

"The side server has information stored on it including preferences, roles, and details relating to

users" and col. 57, lines 3-9 "A component within MTS utilizes role-based security to determine

who may or may not have access to a specific COM component. A role is a symbolic name that

defines a group of users for a package of components. Roles extend Windows NT security to

allow a developer to build secured components in a distributed application"), and in response to

received user identification information, including a password password (col. 25, lines 66-67

"user may be authenticated by verifying a user name and a password"), for providing, the

contents of which vary based on the user's role as a software developer, software tester or

software project coordinator in the software development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon

authentication of the identity of the user…. the user is allowed to view and change the

information… that is associated with the user… single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored…

based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col.

49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the

interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.).

Haswell does not explicitly disclose at least one bug tracking related menu.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system a bug tracking (col. 4, lines 48 "BugTrapper tools") related menu (col. 8, lines 57-60 "The analyzer frame 300 further provides a menu bar 304, a dockable toolbar 306, and a status bar 312. The menu bar 304 provides drop-down menus labeled "File," "Edit," "View," "Executable," and "Help.""").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of having a bug related menu as taught by Wygodny into the method of authorizing and displaying content based on user's role as taught by Haswell. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have a bug related menu to monitore the parallel execution of multiprocessor system as suggested by Wygodny (col. 2, lines 28-50).

The feature of providing bug tracking related menu would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 61.

Per claims 63-66:

The rejection of claim 61 is incorporated, and further, Haswell discloses provide the contents based on user's role in software development process as applied to claim 61 above. Haswell does not explicitly disclose bug tracking related menu.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system a bug tracking (col. 4, lines 48 "BugTrapper tools") related menu (col. 8, lines 57-60 "The analyzer frame 300 further provides a menu bar 304, a dockable toolbar 306, and a status bar 312. The menu bar 304 provides drop-down menus labeled "File," "Edit," "View," "Executable," and "Help.""").

The feature of providing bug tracking related menu would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 61.

Per claim 68, 69:

The rejection of claims 61 is incorporated and further, Haswell does not explicitly disclose accessing a database and retrieving data indicative of a plurality of bugs in a selected software package; and sorting the bugs based upon any one of a plurality of sorting criteria selected by a user.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system accessing a database and retrieving data indicative of a plurality of bugs in a selected software package (col. 5, lines 44-53 "An agent-side trace library... The client-side trace library... the agent-side trace library 124 is referred to collectively as the "trace library."... obtain the trace information" and col. 2, lines 54-55 "identifying and isolating bugs within a client program"); and sorting the bugs based upon any one of a plurality of sorting criteria selected by a user (col. 7, lines 39-40 "analyzer 106 is used to analyze the trace data and isolate the bug" and col. 8, lines 40-43 "developer 112 to open multiple trace tree windows and define a different filter (i.e., sorting) for each of window... multiple windows with different filters are handled by the User Interface").

The feature of providing accessing a database and retrieving data indicative of a plurality of bugs in a selected software package; and sorting the bugs based upon any one of a plurality of sorting criteria selected by a user would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 61.

Per claim 75-77:

The rejection of claim 61 is incorporated and further, Haswell disclose:

a first user having a first role in developing said software package to a second user having a

second role in developing said software package (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the

identity of the user.... the user is allowed to view and change the information... that is associated

with the user... single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored... based on the information

associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the

user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored

based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.)

Haswell does not explicitly disclose transmitting a bug related message.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system transmitting a bug

related message (col. 3, lines 31-32 "developer sends the TCI file for the particular client to a

remote user") using a provided bug related menu (col. 4, line 48 and col. 8, lines 57-60).

The feature of providing transmitting a bug related message would be obvious for the set

forth in the rejection of claim 61.

Per claim 79:

The rejection of claim 61 is incorporated and further, Haswell discloses accessing a test plan

identifying a plurality of tests to be performed with respect to an identified software package

(col. 50, lines 40-43"Develop and execute a test plan to properly exercise new application

including new, modified, and unmodified functionality").

Per claim 80:

The rejection of claim 61 is incorporated and further, Haswell does not explicitly disclose edit

bug related information in response to user input via at least one bug tracking related menu.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system edit bug related

information in response to user input (col. 6, lines 18-20 "the developer can edit the TCI file 120

or create a new TCI file 120 while viewing results from a trace log file 122") via at least one bug

tracking (col. 4, lines 48 "BugTrapper tools") related menu (col. 8, lines 57-60 "The analyzer

frame 300 further provides a menu bar 304, a dockable toolbar 306, and a status bar 312. The

menu bar 304 provides drop-down menus labeled "File," "Edit," "View," "Executable," and

"Help.""").

The feature of providing edit bug related information in response to user input via at least

one bug tracking related menu would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 61.

15.   Claims 70-71, 73-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Haswell, Wygodny in view of US Pub. No. 2001/0049697 to Johndrew et al. (hereinafter called

Johndrew).

Per claims 70-71, 73-74:

The rejection of claim 61 is incorporated and further, neither Haswell nor Wygodny explicitly

disclose wherein said sorting criteria includes video game stage or a video game character or the

status of the bug or the type of bug or the reported date of the bug.

However, Johndrew discloses in an analogous computer system sorting criteria includes

video game stage or a video game character or the status of the bug or the type of bug or the

reported date of the bug (page 3 and 4, paragraph 46 "FIG. 7 shows the data collected by the

process of FIG. 6. Bug ID screen 700 includes the query component selection index 310, a bug

identifier header 705, a bug headline 710 and a release table 715. Bug identifier header 705

gives the bug identifier associated with the information on the screen… Bug headline 710

contains a short one line description of the bug… Column 725 indicates the status of the bug…

Column 730 contains the date and time that software fixing the bug").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of sorting/identifying bugs based on unique

identifiers as taught by Johndrew into the method for monitoring the software bug as taught in

the combination system by Haswell and Wygodny. The modification would be obvious because

of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to sort the bugs to provide complete bugs

free software application to client as suggested by Johndrew (page 1, paragraph 10).

16.   Claim 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haswell,

Wygodny in view of admitted prior art (APA).

Per claim 78:

The rejection of claim 61 is incorporated and further, neither Haswell nor Wygodny explicitly

disclose attaching to a bug description a digitized video file for visually displaying at least one

screen display showing an identified bug.

However, APA discloses attaching to a bug description a digitized video file for visually

displaying at least one screen display showing an identified bug (Applicant's specification, page

2, lines 9-11 "tester... associate a tester recorded sequence of game screen displays to provide a visual depiction of the error sequence")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of displaying a digitized video file for visually displaying as taught in APA into the method for monitoring the software bug as taught in the combination system by Haswell and Wygodny. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to display the bug information which is would be for video game to have better understanding of the bugs found during testing as suggested in APA (pages 3, lines 4-12).

Conclusion

17.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satish S. Rampuria whose telephone number is (571) 272-3732. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm Monday to Friday. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2191
/Wei Y Zhen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191